

REMARKS

Claims 15, 16, 19 and 32-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for purportedly being unpatentable over Stanglemaier et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,732,507) in view of Stroia et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,745,560) and Liu et al. (U.S. 6,964,156). Applicants disagree.

Liu et al. is cited for purportedly disclosing that it is conventional in the art to arrange an EGR line (43) downstream of the reformer and the reformat is supplied to the engine via the EGR line to improve an engine operation and to reduce harmful emissions in an exhaust gas stream (Office Action page 4) However, Applicants note that the earliest priority date of the present application, April 5, 2003, precedes the priority date of Liu et al., i.e. October 23, 2003. The present application claims foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §119(a)-(d) or (f) to German application no. 103 15 593.7, filed April 5, 2003, the priority of which is acknowledged in the Office Action. As such, Liu et al. is not prior art to the current invention. If necessary, Applicants will provide a translation of the certified copy of the priority application and a statement that the translation of the certified copy is accurate.

As demonstrated in Applicants' response filed July 1,2009. the combination of Stanglemaier et al. and Stroia et al. fail to teach or suggest the invention as claimed. Neither reference teaches or suggests an exhaust gas recirculation arranged downstream of the reforming unit: Nor do they teach or suggest supplying reformat to the engine by way of a exhaust gas recirculation. Thus, the combination of cited references fails to render the invention as claimed obvious.

Applicants request that the Office reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claims 15, 16, 19 and 32-41 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for purportedly being unpatentable over Stanglemaier et al., in view of Stroia et al. and Liu et al., as applied to claims 16 and 15 and further in view of Murachi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,746,989). Applicants disagree.

Liu et al. is not prior art to the present application, as discussed above, and the combination of Stanglemaier et al., Stroia et al. and Murachi et al. fails to teach or suggest the invention as claimed.


As discussed in Applicants' July 1, 2009 response, the combination of Stanglemaier et al. and Stroia fails to teach or suggest an exhaust gas recirculation arranged downstream of the reforming unit and thus fail to render the invention as claimed obvious. Murachi et al. does not compensate for the deficiencies of Stanglemaier et al. and Stroia et al. because Murachi et al. also fails to teach or suggest an exhaust gas recirculation arranged downstream of the reforming unit. Therefore the combination of Stanglemaier et al., Stroia et al. and Murachi et al. fails to teach or suggest the invention as claimed and fails to render the invention as claimed obvious. Applicants request that the Office reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claims 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket # 095309.56876US).

Respectfully submitted,

October 5, 2009


Mary Anne Schofield
Registration No. 36,669

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
MAS:mas